1	VINCENT ROSENBALM 6/30/08
· · 2	2100 NAPA VALLEJO HIGHWAY FILED
3	NAPA CAUFORNIA 94558 NICHADONIA
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT
5	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6	INRE 3 NOTICE OF APPEAL
7	VINCENT ROSENBALM for certificate OF
8	PlaintiFF 3APPEALABILITY
9	3 NO: COB-1765 si (pr)
10	3NO: CO8-1835-51GOM
11.	No: CO8-1836 sign
12	NO: CO8-2064 si (pr)
13	I horeby give notice I appeal
14	The above cases to the U.S. court
15	OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT
16	FROM +HE U.S. DISTRICT COURTY UDSMANT
17	ONOR ABOUT JUNE 23, ZOOS BY JUDGE
18	IUSton, I Believe A conflict of INHER
19	EST EXISTS BETWEEN JUDGE ILLISTON
20	FOR ANY OF MY CASES IN BOTH
21	+HE U.S. DISTRICT COURT AND COURT
22	OF APPEALS DUE to JUDICIAL
23	MIS CONDUCT. UNDER THE PENALTY
24	OF Perjury +His is true AND
25	CORRECT 40 + HE BUSTOFMY KNOWLEDGE
26	- Jusent Rosenbalm
27	6/30/08
28	

1	VINCENT ROSENBALM 6/30/08
2	2100 NAPA VALLEJO HIGHWAY
3	NAPA, CALIFORNIA 94558
• 4	U.S. DISTRICT COURT
5	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6	DECLARATION INSUPPORT OF APPEAL
7	1) ONE OF THE REASONS FOR NOT
8	PAVING + HE FEES IS I APPLIED
9	UNDER 28 U.S.C 1915G) DUE
10	
11	THAT NEARLY KILLED ME, AFTER
12	I WAS Blaten Negr Death, I Fear
13	FOR MY LIFE DUE tO +HIS
14	ATTACK. UNDER 28 U.S. (1915G)
	I SHOULD BE ELIGIBLE FOR
16	A WAIVEY OF FEES,
17	2) POLICE OFFICEN (STARK) STOLE about
18	\$5600 CASH/CHECKS AT APREST AND
19	REFUSES TO RETURN THEM:
20	3) A CONFLICT OF INTEREST EXISTS
21	petween JOBE ILLSTON AND ME
22	OVER A JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT INVESTIGATION
23	When the PENALTY OF PERJURY
24	+HIS IS TIVE AND CORRECT
25	to THE BEST OF MY KNOWledge.
26	- Uncent Rosenbalm
27	
28	

United States District Court

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In Re.

VINCENT ROSENBALM,

Plaintiff.

No. C 08-1765 SI (pr) No. C 08-1835 SI (pr) No. C 08-1836 SI (pr) No. C 08-2064 SI (pr)

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

On May 8, 2008, the court denied pauper status for plaintiff and ordered him to pay the full \$350.00 filing fee for each of these four actions by June 2, 2008 or each action would be dismissed. That deadline has passed but plaintiff never paid the filing fee for any of the actions. For the foregoing reasons, each of these actions are dismissed because plaintiff failed to comply with the order to pay the filing fee. The application to proceed <u>in forma pauperis</u> filed on May 15, 2008 in Case No. C 08-2064 SI is DISMISSED because the court had already denied pauper status is that action. (Docket # 6.)

The clerk shall close the file for each of the four cases.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June <u>13</u>, 2008

SUSAN ILLSTON United States District Judge Case 3:08-cv-01765-SI Document 9-2 Filed 07/02/2008 Page 1 of 1

2100 mara va raa, CA 94558 SAN FRANCISCO, CAGY 45060LDENGATE AVE S. DISTRICT COURT

POSO NOTONOSTO

